REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration of the above-mentioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and following discussion.

1. Claims 36 - 40, 118, and 126 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,534,010 (Peterson). The Applicant disagrees with these rejections. Claim 36 includes the feature of the second section having at least a first margin and a second margin. The first section being integral to the second section at the first margin and the third section being integral to the second section at the second margin. This feature is neither claimed nor shown in the Peterson reference. The Examiner notes a first margin and a second margin on the marked-up front page of the Peterson reference, however applicant respectfully observes that the first and second margins called out by the examiner are actually part of the first and third sections, respectively. This is unlike the present claim in which the feature of a first and second margin is part of the second section. The Peterson reference is unable to include margins on the second section due to the filamentous nature of the Peterson device. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that claim 36 presents patentable material and avoids the Peterson reference. Claims 37 - 40, inclusive depend from claim 36, believed allowable, and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 118 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Peterson. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 118. Claim 118 includes the features noted with regard to claim 36, namely a second section having a first and second margin, but further, includes the feature of each margin being linear. As noted with regard to the rejection of claim 36, the device disclosed in the Peterson reference is unable to include this feature, since the second section of Peterson's device is filamentous in nature, rendering it incapable of including a margin, particularly a linear margin. Accordingly, claim 118 is asserted to be in condition for allowance and avoid the Peterson reference. Further, the Applicant disagrees with Examiner's rejection of claim 126. Claim 126 depends from allowed claim 33. It is asserted that since claim 126 depends from an allowed claim, it is also in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 126 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is requested.
2. Claims 42, 47, 49, 118, 120-122, 124, and 125 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson. Applicant disagrees with these rejections. As mentioned

with regard to the rejections under 102(b), above, independent claim 36 is believed to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 42, 47, and 49, which depend therefrom are also believed to be in condition for allowance. As has been discussed in paragraph 1, above, independent claim 118 includes the features of a second section having a first and second margin, wherein each margin is linear. The device disclosed in the Peterson reference is unable to include this feature, since the second section of Peterson's device is filamentous in nature, rendering it incapable of including a margin, particularly a linear margin. Accordingly, claim 118 is asserted to be in condition for allowance and avoid the Peterson reference. Claims 120-122, 124, and 125 depend from claim 118, believed allowable, and as such are assert to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is requested.

3. Claims 50 - 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,234,462 (Pavletic). Claims 50 - 54 depend from claim 36 believed allowable, and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 50 - 54 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) is requested.
4. Allowance of claims 33 - 35, 43 - 46, and 106 - 117 is noted and appreciated. Applicant has noted a typographical error in allowed claim 43. Accordingly, claim 43 has been amended to correct the error. No new matter has been added.
5. Claim 48 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 48 has been amended according to the Examiner's suggestion and is now believed to be in condition for allowance.
6. Newly presented claims 127 - 138, inclusive contain features supported in the specification. No new matter has been added. Independent claim 127 includes the features of a first section and a third section comprising an elastic material, with the first section and the third section each having a first side including an adhesive located thereon; and further, a second section including at least a first linear margin and a second linear margin. These features are neither disclosed nor claimed in the references. As has been noted with regard to the rejections of independent claims 36 and 118, above, the device disclosed in the Peterson reference is unable to include this combination of features, since the second section of Peterson's device is filamentous in nature, rendering it incapable of including a linear margin.

Accordingly, newly added claims 127 - 138, inclusive are asserted to be in condition for allowance. Early allowance is requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objections and rejections be removed, that amended claim 48, claims 36 - 40, inclusive, 42, 47, 49 - 54, inclusive, and newly added claims 127 - 138, inclusive, be passed to allowance along with allowed claims 33 - 35, 43, as amended, 44 - 46, and 106 - 117, inclusive

Respectfully Submitted,

By Laura A. Dable
Laura A. Dable, Reg. No. 46,436

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.
Post Office Box 26618
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226
(262) 783 - 1300
22 September, 2003
Customer No.: 26308
SOHN/4115.1294A-PCT US DIV 2/030922 AMENDMENT H

Enclosures: Amendment Transmittal Letter
Return Postcard